UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/521,862	01/21/2005	Paulus Cornelis Neervoort	NL 020772	1298	
24737 7590 03/16/2010 PHILIPS INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY & STANDARDS P.O. BOX 3001			EXAMINER		
			HOEL, MATTHEW D		
BRIARCLIFF	MANOR, NY 10510		ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER		
			3714		
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
			03/16/2010	PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)			
Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	10/521,862	NEERVOORT ET AL.			
Examiner-initiated interview Summary	Examiner	Art Unit			
	Matthew D. Hoel	3714			
All Participants:	Status of Application: pen	<u>iding</u>			
(1) Matthew D. Hoel, examiner.	(3)				
(2) <u>Gregory Thorne, attorney</u> .	(4)				
Date of Interview: 10 March 2010	Time: <u><i>P.M.</i></u>				
Type of Interview:					
Part I.					
Rejection(s) discussed: NF (09-21-2009).					
Claims discussed: 1-17.					
Prior art documents discussed: Kagan (5,618,045 A); Sharma (6,287,200 B1); Meyers (6,674,995 B1); Lynch (6,561,809 B1); Sugimoto (6,626,756 B2).					
Part II. SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED: See Continuation Sheet					
Part III.					
 It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate redirectly resulted in the allowance of the application. The of the interview in the Notice of Allowability. It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate redid not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary 	examiner will provide a writte ecord of the substance of the	en summary of the interview, since	ne substance		
/Peter D. Vo/ Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 3714 /M. D. H./ Examiner, Art Unit 3714 (A)	pplicant/Applicant's Representat	ive Signature – if a	appropriate)		

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: The examiner upon reviewing the case believed that the new dependent claims pertaining to determining the size and shape of the virtual playfield corresponding to the actual playfield were significant in light of Kagan and Sharma and the independent claims as a whole. The examiner believed that these limitations corresponding to the determined type of game being played put into independent form would be allowable and sum up what the claims as a whole are trying to do. The examiner believes that determining the size of the playfield is supported at parent application EP 02078012.8, 7:14-19. The other proposed limitations are supported by the current specification. Mr. Thorne suggested putting the relative orientations of the mobile devices as well as the relative locations of the mobile devices into the independent claim for discussion purposes; these limitations correspond to para. 117 of the specification 2005/0288100 A1. In para. 117, the tops of the modular units facing each other allow these players to be on one team; the bottoms of the modular units facing each other allow these players to be on a second team. The examiner has 112 considerations about this passage as it is unclear whether it is an electrical or wireless connection, which would determine if the orientation is a physical connection or merely whether or not the devices angularly face each other. Referring to Kagan, Fig. 1, these modular units are already facing each other, so they can presumably be on the same team. The IR detectors of Kagan will have a conical zone of sensitivity as evidenced by Thompson (5,517,201 A, 3:46-4:9). One team of players using Kagan's devices could face each other to line up in each others' IR sensitivity zones to form one team; another could do the same to form another team. The examiner believed that Kagan disclosed assigning players with the modular devices to separate teams, each team comprising two or more players, and that Sharma demonstrated the obviousness of playing a game, such as a virtual volleyball game with the players' virtual positions corresponding to their physical positions (Figs. 2, 3, & 5, and corresponding descriptions). Mr. Thorne may submit proposed amendments by e-mail for discussion purposes. No exact allowable claim language was agreed on..